REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-24 are pending. By this Amendment, new claims 8-24 are presented. Support for the new claims 8-24 can be found, for example, in the present specification at paragraphs [0015] to [0019], and in original claims 1-7. No new matter is added. In view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §102

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 2, 4 and 5 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over JP 2003-146951 to Ichinosawa et al. ("Ichinosawa"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claim 1 recites "[a]n aromatic compound represented by the following general formula (1):

$$R^{14}$$
 R^{13}
 R^{12}
 R^{14}
 R^{13}
 R^{12}
 R^{14}
 R^{13}
 R^{12}
 R^{14}
 R^{15}
 R^{16}
 R^{17}
 R^{19}
 R

wherein ... at least one of R¹ to R⁹ represents a substituted or unsubstituted aryl group having 6 to 40 carbon atoms; and at least one of R¹⁰ or R¹⁴ represents a substituted or unsubstituted aryl group having 6 to 40 carbon atoms" (emphasis added). <u>Ichinosawa</u> does not disclose or suggest such an aromatic compound.

As indicated above, claim 1 requires that at least one of R¹⁰ or R¹⁴ represents a substituted or unsubstituted aryl group. The Office Action asserts that the compound of

8

formula (I) in <u>Ichinosawa</u> corresponds to the compound of formula (1) in claim 1. *See* Office Action, page 3. Applicants respectfully disagree.

In the aromatic compound of claim 1, at least one of R¹⁰ or R¹⁴ is an aryl group.

Thus, in the aromatic compound of claim 1, there is an aryl group is substituted at the "ortho" position of the phenyl group, which is bonded at the 2-position of anthracene (an aryl group is provided at a position immediately adjacent to the position where the phenyl group is bonded to the anthracene). Ichinosawa simply does not disclose or suggest a compound having such structure.

Ichinosawa discloses some compounds where an aryl group is substituted at the "para" position of the phenyl group, which is bonded at the 2-position of anthracene (an aryl group is provided at a position opposite from to the position where the phenyl group is bonded to the anthracene). See, e.g., Ichinosawa, Table (note R₁ in compounds (C-149) to (C-168)). While Ichinosawa may disclose a general structure having similarities to the aromatic compound of claim 1, Ichinosawa does not disclose or suggest the aromatic compound.

Applicants surprisingly discovered that the solubility (and thus film-forming capability) of an aromatic compound can be improved by providing a structure in which an aryl group is substituted at the "ortho" position of the phenyl group, which is bonded at the 2-position of anthracene. This unexpected, superior result is shown, for example, in the Examples of the present specification. *See* MPEP §2144.09 (citing *In re Papesch*, 315 F.2d 381 (C.C.P.A. 1963)) ("[a] *prima facie* case of obviousness ... is rebuttable by proof that the claimed compounds possess unexpectedly advantageous or superior properties"). As is evident from a comparison of Example 11 and Comparative Example 2 of the present specification (*see* paragraphs [0073], [0074], [0080] and [0081]), an aromatic compound as recited in claim 1, in which an aryl group is substituted at the "ortho" position of the phenyl

group, which is bonded at the 2-position of anthracene, demonstrate superior solubility (and thus film-forming capability) to compounds that are not so configured. This evidence rebuts any suggestion that it would have been obvious to modify the compounds of <u>Ichinosawa</u> to obtain the aromatic compound of claim 1.

<u>Ichinosawa</u> does not disclose or suggest the structure of the aromatic compound of claim 1, or recognize the benefits (e.g., solubility) stemming therefrom.

As explained, claim 1 is not anticipated by <u>Ichinosawa</u>. Claims 2, 4 and 5 depend from claim 1 and, thus, also are not anticipated by <u>Ichinosawa</u>. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §103

A. <u>Ichinosawa</u>

The Office Action rejects claims 1-5 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over <u>Ichinosawa</u>. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

For the reasons discussed above, <u>Ichinosawa</u> fails to disclose or suggest each and every feature of claim 1. Thus, claim 1 would not have been rendered obvious by <u>Ichinosawa</u>. Claims 2-5 depend from claim 1 and, thus, also would not have been rendered obvious by <u>Ichinosawa</u>. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

B. Ichinosawa and Kawamura

The Office Action rejects claims 6 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over <u>Ichinosawa</u> in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,074,734 to Kawamura et al. ("<u>Kawamura</u>"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

10

For the reasons discussed above, <u>Ichinosawa</u> fails to disclose or suggest each and every feature of claim 1. <u>Kawamura</u> does not remedy the deficiencies of <u>Ichinosawa</u>.

<u>Kawamura</u> is cited for its alleged disclosure of an organic luminescence device including a hole injecting layer containing styrylamine. *See* Office Action, page 7. However,

<u>Kawamura</u>, like <u>Ichinosawa</u> fails to disclose or suggest the aromatic compound of claim 1.

Accordingly, the combination of references fails to disclose or suggest each and every feature of claim 1.

As explained, claim 1 would not have been rendered obvious by <u>Ichinosawa</u> and <u>Kawamura</u>. Claims 6 and 7 depend from claim 1 and, thus, also would not have been rendered obvious by <u>Ichinosawa</u> and <u>Kawamura</u>. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

New Claims

By this Amendment, new claims 8-24 are presented. New claims 8-24 depend from claim 1 and, thus, are believed to be patentable for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1.

Application No. 10/580,249 Reply to Office Action of April 29, 2009

Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that claims 1-18 are in condition for allowance. Prompt reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Norman F Oblog

Jacob A. Doughty

Registration No. 46,67/1

Customer Number 22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000 Fax: (703) 413 -2220 (OSMMN 08/07)